

**REMARKS****Summary of the Office Action**

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,236,064 B1 to *Mase et al.*

Claims 10-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Mase et al.* in view of alleged “Prior Art (specification of the instant application).”

Claims 2-9 stand allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Claims 12-26 stand allowed.

**Summary of the Response**

Applicants have amended claim 1. Claims 1-26 are presently pending.

**The Disposition of the Claims**

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,236,064 B1 to *Mase et al.* Claims 10-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Mase et al.* in view of alleged “Prior Art (specification of the instant application).” In view of the Reasons for Allowance at section 7 of the Office Action dated October 19, 2004 and the Response to Arguments at page 4 of the Final Office Action dated February 9, 2005 (wherein it is recognized that the two TFT pairs of *Mase et al.* are connected in series), Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to recite that “the first and second driving units are connected in parallel.” Because *Mase et al.* does not teach or suggest this feature, Applicants respectfully assert that independent claim 1, as amended, is allowable. Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 10-11 are allowable at least because of their dependencies from independent claim 1, as amended, and the reasons set forth above.

While Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter in dependent claims 2-9, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 2-9 are allowable at least because of their dependencies from independent claim 1, as amended, and the reasons set forth above.

Claims 12-26 stand allowed.

### **Conclusions**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendments to place the application in clear condition for allowance or, in the alternative, in better form for appeal. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

By: 

Robert J. Goodell

Registration No. 41,040

Dated: July 11, 2005

Customer No. 09629

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20004

Telephone: (202) 739-3000

Facsimile: (202) 739-3001